

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, and 23-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended. Claims 2, 12, and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, and 23-30 are patentable over the art of record and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, and 23-30.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Lee for holding a telephone interview with their representative, Janaki K. Davda, on Tuesday, September 26, 2006, at 4:00 pm (EST). During the telephone interview, proposed claim amendments to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections were discussed. Applicants' representative agreed to submit claim amendments. No further agreement was reached.

Claims 1, 11-20, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicants respectfully traverse, but, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 are rejected as inoperative as failing to disclose any step for building an index. Applicants have amended the claims to indicate that index creation builds the index with results of recent global analysis computations for processing of documents existing at a certain point in time (e.g., Specification, page 4, paragraph 11; page 13, paragraph 47).

Claims 11-20 are rejected as not manufacturing anything. Applicants have amended claim 11 to further clarify the term "article of manufacture" as comprising one of hardware logic and a computer readable medium including a program for building an index, wherein the hardware logic or program causes operations to be performed. Applicants respectfully submit that such an article of manufacture builds an index as claimed.

For example, paragraph 51 on pages 14-15 of the Specification, states:

The term "article of manufacture" as used herein refers to code or logic implemented in hardware logic (e.g., an integrated circuit chip, Programmable Gate Array (PGA), Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC), etc.) or a computer readable medium,

such as magnetic storage medium (e.g., hard disk drives, floppy disks, tape, etc.), optical storage (CD-ROMs, optical disks, etc.), volatile and non-volatile memory devices (e.g., EEPROMs, ROMs, PROMs, RAMs, DRAMs, SRAMs, firmware, programmable logic, etc.).

Claims 21-30 are rejected as the limitations do not construct a computer system. Applicants have amended claim 21 to clarify that the computer system comprises hardware logic that builds the index as claimed (e.g., paragraph 51 on pages 14-15 of the Specification).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse, but, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 are rejected as the terms “global analysis computations” and “intermediate results” are not understood. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to overcome the rejection. For example, paragraph 5 (pages 1-2) of the Specification describes:

Global analysis computations may be described as extracting properties from a global view of documents in a corpus (e.g., documents available on the Web). One example of a global analysis computation is the page rank computation. A page rank computation takes as input a directed graph in which every document in the corpus is a node and every hyperlink between documents is an edge. Then, the page rank computation produces as output a global rank for each document in the corpus. Other examples of global analysis computations are duplicate detection (i.e., the identification of pages with similar or the same content) and template detection (i.e., identification of which parts of a Web page are part of a site template).

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the term “intermediate results” as comprising the output of one of the global analysis computations that is input into another one of the global analysis computations (e.g., paragraph 46, page 13 of the Specification; FIG. 9B).

Claims 2, 12, and 22 are rejected as the term “global analysis information” is not understood. Applicants have cancelled claims 2, 12, and 22 without prejudice.

Claims 3, 13, 23, 4, 14, 24, and 8, 18, and 28 are rejected as the term “global analysis computations” is not understood. This term has been clarified in the independent claims 1, 11, and 21 from which claims 3, 13, 23, 4, 14, 24, and 8, 18, and 28 depend.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, and 23-30 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: September 28, 2006

By: _____/Janaki K. Davda/_____

Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7973
Fax: 310-556-7984